DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 676 HE 025 588

AUTHOR Peters, John G.; Brinkerhoff, David B.
TITLE Balancing the Reward Structures of Promotion, Tenure, and Merit.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992). For a related paper, see HE 025 590.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Instruction; *Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Merit Pay; Policy Formation; Program Effectiveness; Research Universities; Rewards; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; *Tenure; Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *University of Nebraska Lincoln

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis of a long-term project at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) to insure that effective teaching is rewarded. The document attempts to frame the issues and explore the effects of the project first in the area of the role of teaching in the awarding of tenure. Noting the tradition in academe of awarding tenure on a record of research and publication, the section explores the conditions under which teaching activity might be the basis for tenure and the teaching assessment issues that attend such policy. Going on to explore the role of teaching in promotion, the parallels between this area and tenure are pointed out as well as differences and generally accepted standards for promotion. Here it is noted that the effect of the UNL project on promotion cannot yet be measured. A final section looks at the role of teaching in the merit process and the project's attempt to address that area with a three-step merit matrix model. A conclusion notes the complexity of any effort to change the culture of a research university and offers some reflections on the project at UNL. (19 references) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345676

Balancing the Reward Structures of

Promotion, Tenure, and Merit

by
John G. Peters
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

and

David B. Brinkerhoff
Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

HE 025-582

Prepared for delivery to the 1992 AERA Annual Meeting Program, San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John G. Peters

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Balancing the Reward Structures of Promotion, Tenure, and Merit

by
John G. Peters
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Introduction:

This paper presents a discussion of the preliminary results of a project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education and titled, **From Regard to Reward: Improving Teaching at a Research-Oriented University**. The major goal of this project is to insure that effective teaching is rewarded at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and is a joint effort between the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and the College of Arts and Sciences (see Barrett, 1992 for a detailed description of this project).

Specifically, this paper presents an administrative view of the effectiveness of the UNL FIPSE Project at achieving its goal to bring about a more appropriate balance in the reward structures at a research-oriented university for instructional activities relative to service but especially research and creative activities. The impact of the FIPSE project will be assessed on the reward structures leading to tenure, to promotion (particularly promotion to the full professorial rank), and on the distribution of merit increases.

The Role of Instructional Activity (Teaching) in Tenure:

The awarding of a continuous appointment, tenure, by an institution of higher education to a faculty member represents the most significant commitment a college and university can make since in involves both the protection of the academic freedom of a

faculty member and also secures continuous employment except for extraordinary circumstances. Therefore, the institution must be sure that the record produced by the candidate during the tenure probationary period and the promise for continued productivity fits the role and mission of the university and that the quality of performance of the candidate is at the appropriate level. At an institutional such as the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) which is a member of the American Association of Universities (AAU) as well as a Land-Grant University, faculty members are expected to establish independent records of research/creative activity, to teach well, and to provide appropriate service to the university, the community and their profession. Traditionally, such universities have hired and tenured scholars or artist/teachers and have expected these faculty members to contribute to the advancement of new knowledge and/or creative activity and to integrate this new knowledge into their classroom experience. I believe it would be fair to conclude, therefore, that the development of a creative or research record has been viewed as a necessary condition for tenure at research-oriented universities, and that teaching ability and performance in classroom and non-classroom environments is expected, but without an established research record, a good teaching record alone would not be sufficient to award tenure. There are exceptions to this, of course, but I believe this has been both the practice and the perceived norm among both faculty and administrators. For instance, recent changes in the guidelines for faculty evaluation, tenure, and promotion at UNL provide flexibility in awarding tenure to an individual if that person was hired specifically or in large measure to provide classroom instruction, and if their employment contract was explicit about expectations for tenure. To date, however, no faculty have been hired in the College

of Arts and Sciences in tenure leading positions specifically for the purpose of providing instruction.

Several issues have arisen among faculty and administrators, however, about the role of teaching in the tenure process. When the FIPSE project was initiated at UNL in 1989, a survey of faculty was conducted by the investigators to assess faculty attitudes and concerns about the reward of teaching. As a result of this survey certain "pressure points for the reward of teaching" were identified by the faculty and "action plans were developed to help alleviate the concerns (see Edwards, 1992 for a more complete discussion). Pressure points identified by faculty with respect to the reward of tenure and teaching focused on three issues: specification of how tenure is achievable on the basis of quality teaching; definition of scholarship in teaching; and the definition of an acceptable publication record in teaching. Although it is yet too early in the UNL FIPSE Project to determine if we have achieved any clarity or reasonable accommodation on the above issues, some of the individual departmental plans have begun to address the important topic of the relationship between good teaching and scholarship.

It is clear that a faculty member can receive tenure by producing a publication record based on teaching. Here, the candidate presumably is conducting research on the effectiveness of new pedagogical techniques, new learning strategies, etc., and the results of this research appear in appropriate outlets such as journals, published proceedings of conferences, disciplinary publications related to teaching and the like. This avenue to tenure varies little from the traditional requirements of research and/or creative activity and in fact the candidate may have an acceptable but not an outstanding record of classroom teaching.

The point here is that this record has attracted the attention and validation of a set of scholars wider than the home campus.

The more important question that the UNL FIPSE Project has attempted to address is under what conditions, if any, is tenure achievable on the basis of a quality record of teaching at a research-oriented university, assuming that the traditional norms for tenure remain in place? I believe that the answer to this question depends less on broadening the definition of scholarship to include teaching (even as appropriate and important that broadening is) but more on our ability to validate quality teaching similar to the way we validate creative or research activity or "publications in teaching" mentioned above.

The heart of all of the plans developed by the departments' participants in the UNL FIPSE Project concerned the need to develop a process to more accurately measure quality teaching. The assumption behind this strategy was the recognition that we do not do a very good job of assessing teaching, and if we could do a better job, a stronger case could be made to the administration for rewarding faculty with tenure, promotion and merit pay for their teaching efforts. Therefore, a rich and impressive array of plans have been implemented along these lines with many departments joining the growing movement toward teaching "portfolios" which currently is diffusing throughout the higher education community (see Edwards for specific plan details).

Even assuming that these plans and efforts result in enhancing our confidence in evaluating quality teaching, the awarding of tenure for quality teaching would still have to meet the test of external validation akin to what we expect for research and creative activities. In other words, the awarding of tenure to a faculty member based on quality

teaching would be much clearer if peers and university officials knew that the faculty members' teaching record was known and accepted by appropriate individuals off the local campus. Such efforts are underway in some institutions in American higher education but much more could be done in this regard. Although not the subject of this paper, several strategies could be pursued by institutions interested in finding a way to evaluate quality instruction as the basis for tenure. For instance, bringing external individuals to campus to observe, evaluate, and comment on the candidate's teaching at a few critical points during the tenure probationary period might be appropriate. Also, submitting a tenure candidate's teaching portfolio/file for review by a panel of external reviewers, much as we do for the research record could prove helpful. Finally, I believe that the disciplinary associations themselves must take the lead in helping departments and universities establish appropriate standards and methods for the evaluation of quality instruction in their academic areas.

The Role of Instructional Activity (Teaching) in Promotion:

Much of what has been said regarding teaching and tenure is relevant to promotion as well. However, there are a few differences which are worth mentioning. First, tenure is generally construed as an institutional commitment to an individual faculty member who has achieved a level of performance in those areas which are important to the role and mission of the institution coupled with the expectation of future achievement. Promotion, however, while still linked to the institution's role and mission, is more closely related to the norms associated with one's discipline and can be viewed as a reward for achieving a certain level of performance or expertise in the discipline. This is particularly true in the case of

promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

Referring once more to the faculty survey which was conducted at the initiation of the UNL FIPSE Project, some faculty indicated that the "pressure point" and goal they would like to achieve would be to "redefine eligibility for full professor with appropriate teaching criterion to allow for exceptional teaching performance." This has been an issue on the UNL campus and I suspect on many other research-oriented campuses across the U.S. The focus of this issue is the norm or standard that only those faculty who have achieved a level of national disciplinary prominence for their research records should be elevated to the highest professorial rank. And, while it is the expectation that all faculty should achieve this rank, some do not during their academic careers. Controversy on research-oriented campuses can be generated, therefore, when a faculty member who has been in rank as Associate Professor for more than a decade, for instance, is put forward by his or her department for promotion to Full Professor on the basis of a excellent teaching record but with a meager or barely adequate research record.

For the purposes of discussion I will quote relevant sections of the various guideline statements that appear in official University of Nebraska documents that are relevant to this issue. I suspect that they are similar to those of other research-oriented universities:

a) "The rank of professor is reserved for those faculty members whose achievements are sufficient to merit recognition as distinguished authorities in their field and who hold the professional respect of their colleagues."

b) "To attain the rank of professor, most phases of a candidate's work must be judged excellent, evidencing a level of sustained creativity in the salient areas of the

candidate's work. Such creativity is of the sort that would merit national recognition in appropriate arenas."

c) "Peers and administrators evaluating a candidate for professor should review documentation of the entire academic career to date. In many units, that record will include outside evaluations. The record of a successful candidate for professor must show evidence of sustained excellence over an extended period of time."

d) For promotion to full professor, there should be clear evidence of continued contribution in the areas of teaching, research, and service significantly beyond the level of accomplishment expected for promotion to associate professor. In general, promotion to full professor will occur after the faculty member has attained a high level of accomplishment in scholarly or creative activity."

(Source: "a," " b," and "c" above from the **University of Nebraska Faculty Handbook**, and "d" from the **College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Handbook**, p. 26).

The above guidelines clearly indicate that there are two general standards which must be met for a faculty member to achieve the rank of full professor: a continued and sustained record of achievement in teaching, research, and service, and a level of achievement in creative activities that merits national recognition and the professional respect of colleagues. To date, the impact of the UNL FIPSE Project on promotion to full professor cannot be assessed. However, if the plans developed by departments encourage a faculty member to produce instructional records that meet the above standards, promotion to full professor on the basis of quality instruction would be enhanced. In addition to the need to validate the teaching record that was mentioned in the section of this paper on

teaching and tenure, I would add that some consideration should be given documenting the role that non-published scholarly activity can have quality teaching. For the immediate future, however, the norms and standards in place at most major, research-oriented universities render promotion to full professor based solely on an excellent record of teaching the exception and not the rule.

The Role of Instruction (teaching) in the Merit Process:

It should come as no surprise that faculty hold the opinion that they are not rewarded appropriately in merit increases for their teaching activities, and that research productivity is rewarded at a much greater level than teaching or service records. One of the stated goals of the UNL FIPSE Project was to put in place procedures to insure that quality instruction was rewarded with merit pay at a level similar to research. One view held by administrators concerning the reward of teaching suggested that funds were made available for the reward of teaching, but that departments or other academic units do not differentially evaluate faculty on teaching performance in the manner that was done for research or creative activity and, therefore, the funds set aside for rewarding teaching were spread more or less evenly across all faculty in a department. This claim induced several departments participating in the FIPSE Project to put in place procedures which they hoped would more adequately assess good teaching, consequently leading to a process whereby teaching performance could be more differentiated. Often I have heard department chairs remark that, "We know who our best teachers are, and we have a few that are solid but not particularly distinguished teachers, but the vast majority of the faculty are very good and

competent teachers."

The College of Arts and Sciences at UNL has had in place for several years a merit evaluation system requiring that every faculty member in each department of the College be evaluated quantitatively on a series of nine common criterion. Therefore, it is possible to determine if participating in the UNL FIPSE Project has made any difference on the merit evaluation for faculty in those departments. First, however, some digression is appropriate to discuss the role of merit reward systems in American higher education.

Colleges and universities increasingly rely on merit systems as a basis to make comparisons in order to set levels of salary compensation. This growth in merit systems can be attributed to the growing competition among institutions to attract and retain the best faculty, for demands for accountability of faculty, and as a reflection of a trend in private industry to provide more financial incentives for employees (Blum, 1989). Although some colleges have adopted a system where all increases are based on merit (Ott, 1989), the most common salary system at the university level appears to be some combination of merit with cost-of-living adjustments (Fassiotto, 1986).

The goal of most merit systems is to relate performance evaluation with salary compensation (Butterfield, 1988), a goal which is commonly justified on the basis of equity and motivation effects. It has been argued that merit pay increases fairness and productivity (Wood, 1988) and serves both as a reward and incentive for excellence (Fassiotto, 1986). From an institutional perspective, a faculty compensation policy is one means by which a college or university influences faculty to work toward institutional goals (Silander, 1983), and a process which should build confidence in faculty that they are being rewarded for the

activities that are central to the mission of their department and university.

These claims aside, the implementation and utilization of merit systems are problematic. Ehli (1986), for example, reports that faculty attitudes in the South Dakota public colleges and university system place a higher priority on keeping salaries competitive than they do on merit pay. For this reason, Botsch and Folsom (1989) provide strong arguments for including "market factors" into salary systems based on merit. There is also some evidence that reduced cooperation and collaborations among college faculty may result when annual pay increments are based on merit evaluations (Burke, 1988). Others report dissatisfaction with operationalizing point systems: measurement systems typically do not evaluate quality, merit evaluators are too subjective, and fair merit systems are difficult to develop (Fassiotto, 1896; Butterfield, 1988). Detailed discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of merit pay programs are summarized elsewhere (Dennis, 1982; Griffith & Neugarten, 1984; and Miller, 1988). Griffith and Neugarten (1984), in particular, caution that universities are in many ways unlikely candidates for successful adoption of merit pay systems.

Where merit pay systems have been implemented in colleges and universities, findings tend to show that research makes more of a difference than does teaching and service in salary allocation (White, 1986). This emphasis, Buzza (1989) notes, has lead to a perceived increase in the need to publish in small colleges in order to receive tenure, promotion, and merit. Even though instruction and research productivity are highly related, there is some evidence that productivity is unrelated to rewards (Johnson & Tuckman, 1985). Such findings result, in part, from the different emphases given in the development and

implementation of various merit schemes. In truth, there are clearly very few "real" merit plans, and those most often fail because of inadequate evaluation systems (Barber, 1983). Where merit programs have been developed "most faculty (and probably most administrators) do not know the dominant system at their university" (Mott & Mjosland, 1989: p. 67).

Although various salary models exist in higher education, the link between organizational goals as stated in the role and mission statements of colleges and universities and individual role and reward expectations is obscure in most merit models. From our perspective, the absence of a salary compensation model driven by the linkage between organizational goals and the expectations of faculty is a major drawback. What is needed is a model that recognizes variation in discipline standards, maintains flexibility to correct inequities, and satisfies individual faculty expectations which are congruent with the role and mission of the institution. A "Merit Matrix Model," which the College of Arts and Sciences at UNL has used for the past eight years, was designed to accomplish these objectives.

The merit matrix model described here was designed to take into account the major criticisms and shortcomings of point systems discussed in the literature. The model is based primarily on the assumption that rewarding performance in terms of clearly articulated role expectations is in the best interest of both institutional goals and individuals.

Overview of the Merit Matrix Model: Faculty salary allocation under the merit matrix model is a three step process:

1. Evaluations of performance in teaching, research, and service are departmentally

based. Using the college's merit matrix, merit ratings are determined internally either by the department chair or in consultation with a department committee that advises the chair.

2. Dean's correction for market factors and other special adjustments such as equity issues, etc.

3. Real per annum salary compensation (dollar increases) are assigned by the Chair with consultation if needed with the Dean. The total salary compensation is a combination of merit, special adjustments, and perhaps cost of living adjustments.

For the purposes of our discussion we will focus on step 1 above, the departmental evaluation stage. In Figure 1, a merit matrix for a fictitious department of 14 faculty members is presented. A quantitative evaluation of each faculty member is conducted on nine areas considered relevant to the job expectations of a typical faculty member, although not all factors apply to every member. The major purpose of requiring each department to evaluate faculty members across these nine criteria is to insure that all faculty members receive a systematic evaluation for their efforts each year. The nine criteria include the quantity (D) and quality (E) of published research or creative activity; an evaluation of external funding activity (F) if appropriate; the quantity (H) and quality (I) of classroom teaching; the quantity (J) and quality (K) of student advising and non-classroom instruction; and the quantity (N) and quality (O) of service activities.

Each of these nine criteria are assessed on a 6 point scale (0 - 5). The evaluations are made at the department level, typically by the chair in conjunction with an advisory or special salary committee. In preparation for this evaluation, each faculty member submits

detailed documentation of their activities in each of the nine categories for the previous year, and in many departments for the previous 2 to 3 years. The materials submitted for the teaching related criteria (H, I, J, and K) have been enhanced significantly in those departments which have participated in the FIPSE Project.

Because academic disciplines differ in emphasis, each department, in consultation with the Dean, establishes weights for the nine categories. For instance, in our fictitious example presented in Figure 1, the overall weight for research is set at 45%, the overall weight for teaching is 45%, and service is set at 10%, with more detailed breakdowns for each of the subcategories. The sum of the weights for all categories is 100%. These weights vary across departments and are arrived at on the basis of department emphasis, department faculty consensus, and negotiations with the Dean. The outcome is a merit assessment formula applied to the unit collectively (although there is nothing in the procedure which precludes individualizing the contracts).

Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to present a detailed analysis of how this system is then used first to determine a merit score distribution for all faculty in a department and then to distribute merit increases according to that distribution, it is important to note that in our fictitious department, for example, 45% of merit funds should go to reward research, 45% for teaching activities, and 10% for service. I have observed that in fact this sort of clear distribution seldom occurs for reasons such as market factors, equity considerations, compression problems, but also for the reason that the variation in the merit scores for the teaching categories is much less than the variation in the scores for research and creative activity or even service. Therefore, if the distribution of merit scores

is "flatter" for teaching than for research, the faculty share more equally in the 45% merit dollars for teaching than they do for research. Put another way, because departments find it more difficult to differentiate (evaluate) the quality of the teaching record for each faculty member, the rewards for teaching are spread more evenly across all faculty, and consequently research productivity becomes more important in the distribution of merit rewards.

This problem of differentiating teaching was recognized by nearly all the departments participating in the UNL FIPSE Project. Therefore, many of their plans anticipated that more detailed attempts to evaluate teaching with such innovations as teaching portfolios would lead to a distribution of merit scores for teaching that approximated the wider variation observed for research scores. I have been able to test this hypothesis in a preliminary and non-systematic way since departmental merit evaluations are available for departments both before and after the implementation of FIPSE plans.

Table I and Table II present departmental comparisons of merit evaluations before and after FIPSE participation. In Table I the means (arithmetic average) for the quantity/quality of classroom teaching, non-classroom teaching, and research are presented, and in Table II the standard deviations are presented for the same categories. Table III presents a list of the College of Arts and Sciences departments participating in the FIPSE Project and the year of participation.

The results of this simple comparison are inconclusive, although several interesting patterns are evident, and perhaps as the full effect of the FIPSE Project is realized in future years, more dramatic results will be observed. First in Table I it is apparent that the mean

evaluations by departments for teaching and research are very similar, with some departmental variation observed. This is a result I anticipated since it is what I have observed for approximately 8 years. Surprisingly, however, there is a tendency in some of the FIPSE departments to show an increase in the mean evaluation for classroom and non-classroom categories. For instance the departments of Anthropology, English, Geography, Music, and Physics and Astronomy show significant increases in mean scores classroom teaching evaluations. My interpretation of this finding, supported by conversations I have had with the chairs and faculty in these departments is that the FIPSE Project has inclined them to be much more serious about their teaching role including the preparation of much more detailed and informative files to document their teaching activities. The result was this observed tendency to give individual faculty members higher than unusual merit scores for their teaching because of the work that went into preparing the teaching assessment file, and presumably the increased effort in the classroom as well.

Regardless of the increase or decrease in the mean score for teaching factors in the merit matrix system, it is the variation in these scores across faculty that is important for the distribution of merit increases. In Table II the standard deviations from the means presented in Table I indicate a tendency in several departments that is counter to my original hypothesis. In fact, many departments participating in the project show even less variation in teaching evaluations than before! Anthropology, English, Geography, Music, and Political Science are departments which exhibit this pattern, with others such as History, Mathematics and Statistics, Physics and Astronomy, Psychology, and Sociology showing little change. Two departments, Biological Sciences and Geology do show a significant change

in increased variation in the classroom teaching category. Table II does confirm, however, that the variations in scores for research are greater than the variation in the scores for teaching.

Conclusions:

Balancing the rewards for teaching, research, and service at a comprehensive, research-oriented university is a very complicated and difficult matter indeed. This paper is a first and very imperfect attempt to frame some of the more significant issues associated with balance in the reward process as they relate to teaching. Clearly, the UNL FIPSE Project has had a beneficial and hopefully a continuing and lasting impact on the reward structure at Nebraska. But the major impact has not necessarily occurred in the direction or the manner that was originally anticipated. Changing the culture of a university, particularly a research-oriented university, is not a simple matter but is the result of clear messages, persistence, consensus building, and the judicious use of both tangible and intangible rewards.

In my judgment projects such as the UNL Fipse Project can create "silent revolutions" on college campuses if the faculty are willing to consider changing the teaching reward climate to the extent that departments take seriously the challenge to develop teaching plans that suit their discipline and department norms, and if the administration is truly committed to helping the faculty bring about this change. For instance, I believe that the UNL FIPSE Project has had an indirect and perhaps direct effect on the "tenure" process in that all departments are much more concerned about the teaching potential of their new hires than

they were before the project. Departments are also more vigilant about the pedagogical development of their junior faculty since teaching assessment has become much more integral to the reappointment of faculty in their tenure leading years. Moreover, departments are and will be presenting much more detailed and valuable teaching files for their candidates for tenure and promotion as a result of the FIPSE Project. "Word" of this emphasis has begun to filter to other departments at UNL and many chairs are beginning to inquire about participation for their unit.

The simple analysis presented on the effect of the FIPSE Project on merit rewards is initially disturbing but with more reflection quite understandable and healthy. FIPSE departments have generated enthusiasm and momentum for faculty to more carefully document their teaching activities, and this activity in turn has stimulated faculty to do a better job of teaching. Collectively then we should expect that departmental variation in teaching would narrow. Paradoxically, this could result in research becoming even more important in merit considerations. However, it is incumbent on administrators to find a way to reward departments which demonstrate such commitment to teaching in terms of salary increases, but also such rewards as better classrooms, better instructional equipment, and more recognition for teaching in general. These non-salary benefits for teaching are very important to most faculty who take pride in their teaching role. Moreover, merit and other compensation policies are in fact the result of a complex array of factors such as market considerations, equity, research productivity, service, teaching, etc., to the extent that it is virtually impossible to cleanly separate the contribution of each to the total salary increase.

In the final analysis the most significant impact of the UNL FIPSE Project has been

on changing the "climate" for good teaching at the University of Nebraska. When faculty and administrators are committed to the goal of enhancing the environment for teaching and if departments and faculty take seriously the development of plans to improve their teaching such as those embodied the 27 plans produced by UNL departments participating in the FIPSE Project, any needed adjustment in the balance of rewards for tenure, promotion, and merit will gradually but surely occur.

TABLE I
Departmental comparisons of Merit Evaluations
Before and After FIPSE Participation
(MEANS)

	Classroom Teaching		Non-Classroom Teaching		Research	
	Before FIPSE	After FIPSE	Before FIPSE	After FIPSE	Before FIPSE	After FIPSE
Anthro	3.82	4.19	3.68	4.04	3.87	3.65
Art & AH	3.27	3.37	3.09	3.11	3.30	3.37
BioSci	3.38	1.93	3.25	2.53	3.64	2.25
English	3.27	3.60	NA	NA	2.98	3.19
Geography	2.88	4.09	2.99	3.71	3.32	3.68
Geology	4.21	3.47	3.89	3.43	3.50	3.72
History	3.50	3.28	1.67	.36	3.11	2.88
Math/Stat	3.13	3.19	1.07	1.21	2.46	2.52
Music	3.32	4.12	3.89	3.49	3.11	3.64
PolSci	3.47	3.33	2.84	3.19	2.89	2.84
Phys/Ast	2.96	3.47	2.81	3.45	3.30	3.11
Psych	3.26	3.35	3.38	3.33	3.11	3.18
Sociology	3.67	3.30	3.84	3.58	3.37	2.71

TABLE II
Departmental comparisons of Merit Evaluations
Before and After FIPSE Participation
(STANDARD DEVIATIONS)

	Classroom Teaching		Non-Classroom Teaching		Research	
	Before FIPSE	After FIPSE	Before FIPSE	After FIPSE	Before FIPSE	After FIPSE
Anthro	.45	.28	1.39	.82	1.79	1.34
Art & AH	.35	.32	.97	.72	.98	.32
BioSci	.70	1.17	.66	1.29	1.29	1.26
English	.70	.50	NA	NA	1.65	1.08
Geography	.74	.35	.53	.48	.84	.72
Geology	.68	1.16	.92	1.16	1.23	1.14
History	.96	.96	1.16	1.15	3.11	2.62
Math/Stat	.96	.91	1.51	1.45	1.59	1.58
Music	.80	.64	.80	1.00	1.18	1.26
PolSci	1.00	.73	.92	.63	1.27	.82
Phys/Ast	.86	.87	1.00	.89	1.27	1.28
Psych	.53	.52	.84	.90	1.11	1.00
Sociology	1.26	1.32	.96	1.14	1.28	1.40

TABLE III

Arts and Sciences Departments Participating in the FIPSE Project by Year

1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
English	Geology	Anthropology
Physics and Astronomy	Mathematics & Statistics	Art & Art History
Psychology	Music	Biological Sciences
	Political Science	English
		Geography
		Geology
		History
		Math/Stat
		Music
		Political Science
		Psychology
		Sociology

FIGURE 1

04-Mar-91

MERIT OVERVIEW DEPARTMENT of _____

Rank each category from 0 to 5:

Rank Classroom Teaching
Quantity in Credit hours/sem
Or equivalent as appropriate

	Faculty Member's Name				RESEARCH: Published Documented Quan	RESEARCH: Published Documented Qual	RESEARCH: Ext. Fundg	TEACHING ETC.: Classroom Quan	TEACHING ETC.: Classroom Qual	TEACHING ETC.: Non-Clsrm & Advising Quan	TEACHING ETC.: Non-Clsrm & Advising Qual	SERVICE: Quan	SERVICE: Qual	M	1990/91 SALARY
	MERIT SCIENCE				D	E	F	H	I	J	K	N	O		
144	Jones, J.	505	35	2716	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4		49000
145	Smith, T.	194	33	6348	2	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	2		56889
146	Allen, P.	127	06	4405	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	5	5		87000
147	Scott, S.	505	50	3697	2	4	2	3	4	4	4	3	3		54000
148	Baker, F.	343	28	5039	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		63000
149	Adams, J.	504	45	1326	2	2	2	4	3	4	3	3	3		67000
150	Thomas, A.	207	88	4987	1	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	3		34000
151	Michaels, D.	505	66	7472	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	3		47986
152	Beason, B.	968	72	7991	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	4		56003
153	Cook, L.	509	68	0032	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4		34959
154	Davis, C.	505	77	9381	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2		37862
155	Klein, G.	449	13	0943	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	3	3		74547
156	George, H.	508	87	6456	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3		38738
157	Evans, B.	293	07	5946	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	5	4		78342
158	TOTAL														779326
159															
160	Overall Weight				45	*	Overall Weight				45	**	Overall	10	
161	Record Wt				80	*	Classroom wt.				80	**	Weight		
162	Funding Wt.				20	*	Noclsrm/advsg wt				20	**			

	RESEARCH QUANT	TEACHING CLASSRM	NO-CLSRM	SERVICE	RESEARCH	TEACHI	SERVICE	MERIT
	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB
	3.00	3.46	3.46	4.00	3.51	3.33	0.85	7.68
	2.45	3.00	3.46	2.00	2.76	2.97	0.43	6.16
	3.00	4.00	3.46	5.00	3.51	3.73	1.07	8.30
	2.83	3.46	4.00	3.00	3.11	3.43	0.64	7.19
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.51	2.88	0.64	7.03
	2.00	3.46	3.46	3.00	2.34	3.33	0.64	6.30
	1.00	3.00	2.45	3.00	1.40	2.77	0.64	4.91
	4.47	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.12	3.84	0.64	9.60
	4.47	4.00	3.46	4.47	5.35	3.73	0.95	10.03
	2.45	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.76	2.88	0.85	6.49
	1.41	2.45	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.26	0.43	4.71
	2.83	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.35	3.84	0.64	7.82
	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.34	2.68	0.64	5.66
	3.46	3.46	3.46	4.47	3.94	3.33	0.95	8.22
	38.38	47.31	45.23	46.94	45.00	45.00	10	100
	0.94	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.23			

REFERENCES

Barber, Larry. 1983. "Teacher Evaluation and Merit Pay." A background paper from the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO.

Barrett, Leverne. 1992. "Implementing an Institutional Change Model for Rewarding Teaching at Research-Oriented Universities." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992.

Blum, Debra E. 1989. "Concept of Pay for Professors Spreads as Competition among Institutions Grows." Chronicle of Higher Education, 36, 7 (October):A1, 20.

Botsch, Robert E. and Folsom, Davis. 1989. "Market Inequity: Incorporating this Critical Element into Faculty Salary Plans." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 40, 1 (Spring):37-47.

Burke, Richard R. 1988. "Research on the Effects of Rewards: Implications for Annual Merit Pay." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego, CA., (Feb).

Butterfield, Barbara. 1988. "Guidelines for an Effective Merit Pay Program." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 39, 3 (Fall):25-32.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson. 1989. "Faculty Perceptions of Publication Expectations in the Small College Setting: Have the Rules Changed?" Paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco (November).

Dennis, Lawrence J. 1982. "Why Not Merit Pay?" Contemporary Education, 54, 1 (Fall):18-21.

Edwards, Donald M. 1992. "Overcoming Instructional Impediments to Rewarding Teaching." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA., April 20-24, 1992.

Ehli, Gerald J. 1986. "Faculty Attitudes Toward Merit Pay in South Dakota's Public Colleges and Universities." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 37, 3(Fall):6-12.

Fassiotto, Michael E. 1986. "The Merit of Merit: Notes on the Arguments for and Against Merit Systems." Paper presented to the Faculty Senate of Chaminade University of Honolulu.

Griffith, W. I. and Neugarten, Dail A. 1984. "Rewarding Teacher Excellence: Organizational Issues and Obstacles." Teaching Sociology, 12, 1 (Oct):71-81.

Johnson, F. Craig and Tuckman, Bruce W. 1985. "Information Requirements for Faculty Merit Pay Decisions." Paper presented at the 25th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Portland (Apr-May).

Miller, Richard I. 1988. "Merit Pay in United States Post-secondary Institutions." Higher Education, 17, 2:219-232.

Mott, Harold and Mjosland, Arne, 1989. "Chaos in Academe: The Salary Spectrum. Journal of Education Finance 15(Summer): 67-83.

Ott, Mary Diederich. 1989. "FY 89 Faculty Salary Review." Office of Institutional Studies, Maryland University, College Park.

Silander, Fred. 1983. "Faculty Compensation Policies." New Directions for Higher Education, 11, 1 (Mar):21-36.

White, Arden. 1986. "Teaching and Research: Independent, Parallel, Unequal."

Wood, Peter H. and Wood, Jane H. 1988. Annual Merit Pay and the Evaluations and Improvement of College Faculty: Problems, Solutions, and More Problems." Paper presented at the 68th Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego, CA (February).